

From: d L [<mailto:dmarkkoch@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2005 1:54 PM
To: MLPAComments@resources.ca.gov
Subject: MLPAComments: MLPA packages 1 and 2 most reasonable

Members of the BRTF:

The MLPA packages 1 and 2 seem to be the most well thought out plans. Personally, I prefer package #2 because it is the most conducive to marine conservation. I am familiar with California marine ecology, and have been actively studying it for the past 6 years or so. The more marine reserves we put in place as opposed to conservation areas, the more likely we are to see spillover effects in a shorter period of time, thus compensating for reduced fishing area in creating greater numbers of fish available just outside the reserves. Also this plan includes marine reserves at key geographical points of land that jut out into the ocean, which would serve as connector reserves for areas north and south of such points. Also, points of land like this usually have higher biodiversity and habitat diversity, which ought to be conserved.

Since the marine protected areas include only one type of MPA within its bounds, they may be easier to enforce. Package 1, however has an interesting pattern of buffering marine reserve areas with conservation areas, which perhaps would be more beneficial if the areas can be clearly marked off for boaters and others using the areas. Otherwise, enforcement may be difficult.

I favor the MLPA package #2 because it pinpoints ecologically important areas for full protection, and leaves many areas open to fishing in between.

Diana Lloyd
M.S. Candidate
Department of Biological Science
California State University, Fullerton